DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 047 SP 033 787

AUTHOR Riley, James D.; Newton, Thomas A.
TITLE Issues of Governance in Teacher Education.
PUB DATE Jan 92
NOTE 31p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Decision Making; Faculty College Relationship; *Governance; Higher Education; *Professional Autonomy; Program Administration; *Schools of Education; *Teacher Education Programs; *Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS *Control Factors (Administrative); *Process Analysis

ABSTRACT

Issues of governance pervade the teacher education field due to the diverse agendas which influence the function of teacher education programs at the institutional level. The purpose of this article is to explore the philosophy and processes of governance. In order to clarify philosophical issues, the following questions are addressed: (1) Are governance structures in teacher education a means to influence or to react to events? (2) What are the beliefs of teacher educators about how they can influence external/internal forces impinging on teacher education? (3) What are the beliefs of teacher educators with respect to the participation of others in control of teacher education? Two questions frame the discussion on processes of governance: (1) How does teacher education establish an appropriate level of autonomy within the university community; and (2) How does the teacher education unit establish an appropriate level of autonomy with respect to external influences? It is concluded that an explicit philosophy of governance must be developed and made apparent within each teacher education program and that the processes of governance must be addressed as an extension of the consensual philosophy. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SP

ED346047

Issues of Governance in Teacher Education

James D. Riley

and

Thomas A. Newton

Northeastern State University

at

Tahlequah, Oklahoma

January 1992

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. D. Riley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Running head: Issues of Governance

SP033784

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Issues of governance will pervade the Teacher Education field for the foreseeable future due to the diverse agendas which influence the functioning of Teacher Education programs at the institutional level. Running counter to the fragmented nature of governance structures is a need postulated by some to envision and create coherent governance structures that are appropriate for Teacher Education in the 1990s and beyond. The purpose of this article is to explore two broad aspects of governance: (a) governance philosophy, and (b) processes of governance.

Governance Philosophy

In order to clarify philosophical issues of governance, certain questions need to be considered.

1. Are governance structures in Teacher Education a means to influence or to react to events?

2. What are the beliefs of Teacher Educators regarding how they can influence external/internal forces which impinge on Teacher Education?

3. What are the beliefs of Teacher Educators with respect to the participation of others in the control of Teacher Education?

Underlying each of these questions is the assumption that Teacher Education must be governed by a common vision or philosophy held by its participants/constituents. According to some, Teacher Education has not been governed by any such vision. "Even though programs have looked remarkably alike through the years--some educational foundations; some methods courses and student teaching--they have not been governed by a consensual philosophy or vision" (Clark & McNergney, 1990).

A coherent and explicitly stated philosophy of governance is the foundation for developing coherent programs. With respect to a governance philosophy, participants must become proactive in promoting a common vision of the education of teachers. To be proactive, proactors must share a common understanding of the contents and structures of governance that facilitate proaction.

If the contexts of Teacher Education are understood to extend beyond the level of individual courses or field experiences, then governance structures must be understood to encompass broader contexts. If Teacher Education is believed to be a moral obligation to children, then proaction must be, in part, aimed at inculcating this value in prospective teachers. Participation in a Teacher Education program by faculty, students, and others

becomes a moral commitment to children who will be taught by the graduates of the program.

Processes of Governance

In order to consider the processes of governance, two questions frame the discussion.

1. How does Teacher Education establish an appropriate level of autonomy within the university community?

2. How does the Teacher Education unit establish an appropriate level of autonomy with respect to external influences?

Underlying each of these questions is the assumption that the processes must be clearly explicated and understood by the participants in Teacher Education. In the past, responsibility for Teacher Education has often been diffused throughout the university. Organizational identity, personnel, budgeting, and decision-making processes often are informal and unclear. The resistance to clear explication of governance processes allows all parties to take responsibility for addressing substantive programmatic issues underlying Teacher Education.

The argument can be made, however, that perpetuating the informality of governance processes also perpetuates the continuing low regard for Teacher Education (Goodlad, 1991; Houston, 1991).

Autonomy in the University Community

Teacher education as an academic unit. An autonomous Teacher Education program within the university has yet to be established as a widely accepted concept. On the one hand, many faculty who are involved in the preparation of teachers in the subject areas do not consider themselves as Teacher Educators. Moreover, administrators in other academic units do not consider Teacher Education as having any status because they may believe that there is no value in education programs. Both administrators and faculty often make such judgments, having never been involved in the Teacher Education course work, field experience, public school classrooms; having never read any literature in the knowledge base(s) of Teacher Education.

One suggestion has been to establish a Center for Pedagogy (Goodlad, 1991) with accompanying high status and priority within the institution in order to delineate the identity of the academic unit and to raise the status of

Teacher Education. Whether this structure is viable for most institutions remains to be seen; however, this proposal serves to wick the basic issue--to what degree can those who are engaged in the preparation of teachers in specialty areas housed in other academic areas (outside of SCDEs) be committed to Teacher Education? And to what extent can a sense of community be established among all of those who are involved in the education of teachers?

The identification of the academic unit must first rest on an acceptance of the mission of Teacher Education and on an understanding of the knowledge base for preparing teachers. Furthermore, the establishment of the identity of Teacher Education as an academic unit must accommodate the natural tension that evolves among the specialty area professional education and general education.

Presumably, participants in Teacher Education, including subject area faculty, professional education faculty, public school personnel, and policy makers need to share a sense of community. However, militating against any sense of a shared intellectual community is the tendency of some academics outside of Teacher Education to blame Schools of Education for their own failure to establish rigorous, thoughtful courses of study in General Education and in the subject areas.

problematic. In spite of recent reform efforts, a case can be made that university Teacher Education units and schools have been and are still engaged in "rearranging the marks on the page" without creating meaningful changes in how teachers are educated. In fact, many of the players may be more intent on maintaining the nature of the current relationship without seeking and understanding the underlying meaning. Historically, it has been rare that anyone asks whether the relationships which currently exist are detrimental or beneficial to the learning of children. The establishment of Professional Development Schools may be the exception to this long-time trend of maintaining the superficiality of university and school relationships.

The organizational identity of Teacher Education is framed by issues on the relationship between Teacher Education and (a) other academic units, (b)central administration, and (c) public schools. Currently, relationships between Teacher Education and these entities are characterized by attention to the surface structure components of Teacher Education: (a) course credits, (b) checklists of requirements, (c) logistics of intern assignments, (d) responsibility for evaluation, and (e) evaluation criteria which have little to do with

On the other hand, the relationship of Teacher Education with other academic units will never be defined until Teacher Education, as a community of scholars, demands a greater voice in establishing curriculum--in defining the relationship of professional education to pedagogical content.

Unfortunately, the discourse between Teacher Education and the other academic units rarely focuses on the obligation to build a coherent program in the specialty areas, general education, and pedagogy. It more likely focuses on battles over which unit controls specific courses.

Teacher Educators must determine how they can retain a voice in the destiny of Teacher Education while seeking appropriate ongoing dialogue which focuses on three questions.

1. What is the appropriate content and structure of General Education for teachers?

2. What is an appropriate course of study for elementary teachers in General Education and the specialty areas?

3. What are appropriate important differences in the structure of specialty areas for teachers and those who are majoring in a subject? In facilitating such dialogue,

Teacher Educators become advocates for a rigorous course of study for all teachers in all three areas: general education, professional education, and subject areas.

Central administration. The dialogue which occurs between and among deans of education, vice presidents, and presidents more often than not revolves around resources, the need for enhanced visibility, and the need for improving the political climate. Creating an ongoing and open dialogue across the campus can only serve to enhance the relationship of Teacher Education to central administration.

Ostensibly, central administration also has an interest in the efficacy of Teacher Education in enhancing the learning of children. In short, university presidents and vice presidents of academic affairs, through providing the resources for highly effective Teacher Education programs, are demonstrating a moral commitment to enhancing the learning of children. However, the historical perceptions of central administration may run counter to the new vision of the mission of Teacher Education: educating teachers to teach all children.

Public schools. The relationship of a Teacher Education unit to the public schools may be equally

what students learn in course work. Until substantive issues (e.g., teacher behavior, learning process, community relationships, shared responsibility for children's learning, and establishing a community for learning), are addressed as a function of those relationships learning, and establishing a community for learning), Teacher Education will continue to lack control over its own destiny and will never achieve the moral vision to which it should aspire.

Personnel. Identification of personnel and personnel roles remains problematic for several reasons. First, the role of faculty in Teacher Education must be clarified with respect to the vision and mission of Teacher Education to enhance the learning of all children. In addition, the role of public school personnel must be redefined with respect to their responsibilities in the education of teachers. And finally, the role of subject area specialists in Teacher Education in program development needs to be clarified.

Teacher Educators, in many institutions, do not see themselves as responsible for participating in the decision making processes related to Teacher Education. Although consistent with the university level academic tradition, they see themselves as responsible for teaching and

developing courses, specifically their own courses. In one recent study (Moore & Hopkins, 1991), for example, faculty did not perceive NCATE standards relating to program coherence as important as administrators did. Moreover, many faculty members are unable to see themselves as influencing even the most basic program issues in Teacher Education.

In another study (RATE IV, 1991), two thirds (67%) of cooperating teachers surveyed stated that their colleagues hold the role of student teacher supervisor in high regard, while only 35% of higher education faculty surveyed agree that their colleagues hold the role of supervision in high regard. Differential attitudes of the various participants toward program components create difficulties in program coherence--the establishment of common . In light of such program development and supervisor issues, the role of Teacher Educator needs to incorporate a broader view of the role definition of faculty in the education of children. Faculty members must begin to see themselves as capable of influencing those programmatic decisions which affect their own futures, and the future of the children taught by the graduates of the program.

Public school personnel most naturally would be expected to see their primary responsibility as the education of all children. In one study (Rate IV, 1991), cooperating teachers expressed a high degree of altruism in their role as cooperating teachers. However, only 36% of the cooperating teachers surveyed reported adequate preparation for that role through ongoing seminars or meetings. Cooperating teachers need a greater involvement in the Teacher Education program to meet the expectations they are to meet in the education of teachers. Their involvement necessitates their commitment to the knowledge base related to the preparation of teachers.

The school administrator's role in Teacher Education is equally problematic. The role of the school administrator in Teacher Education is usually limited to assigning student teachers to teachers who request them. Generally, school administrators are not concerned with the linkage needed between school expectations and the content of the Teacher Education program, nor is such linkage often encouraged. As long as student teachers behave as guests, they will be considered successful in their student teaching experience. Under such circumstances, there is no guarantee that the best teaching practice is delivered to the children in the classroom.

Budget. It is an old axiom in governance that whoever controls the budget controls. Lack of real governance authority is often directly linked to lack of control over budget which may, in turn, be linked to flaws in the overall budgeting process.

Problems in budget can be attributed to two major flaws in the budgeting process.

1. Decision making which separates budget requests and budget expenditures.

2. Decision making which separates decisions on programs and expenditures for those programs.

In certain circumstances, those making budget requests are not the same individuals who decide on whether funds are ultimately expended consistent with original budget requests. Decision making may separate budget requests from expenditures. It is not uncommon, for example, for budgets of Teacher Education as well as other academic units to be raided to make up for shortfalls in other areas of the university. This occurs when institutions do not have adequate contingency funds to cover emergency funding needs or when budgeting at the institutional level is not linked to academic goals. Teacher Education may be particularly vulnerable because of sometimes sizable lump sums (relative to other academic units) available

for intern travel or stipends for cooperating teachers; travel funds for outreach programs which are essential to the required outreach activities.

A related flaw occurs when those who make program decisions are not the same individuals who make decisions on budget expenditures of those programs. For example, decisions on new courses or requirements are often proposed at the departmental level. Budget decisions related to such matters are made at the dean's or vice president's level. Furthermore, budget requests and expenditures are rarely made with a resource impact statement which delineates the impact on human and financial resources. Consideration should be given to requiring program planners to seek or develop a human financial resource impact statement in the proposing of new programs or requirements.

Decision-making processes. Decision-making processes in Teacher Education are often characterized by (a) informality, and (b) insularity. In particular, decision-making processes on university campuses purportedly occur in an air of collegiality. However, many decisions which are made informally are rarely

recorded. Unfortunately, informality may foster a conspiracy of mediocrity.

The conspiracy of mediocrity is reflected in an unwritten agreement that quality issues in Teacher Education will never be addressed as long as the various players are left to pursue their own agendas. For example, arts and sciences faculty involved in Teacher Education concentrate on teaching the "academics" and often criticize Teacher Education programs to their students. For some reason, they believe they are qualified as critics even though many of them have never been in the public school classroom as teachers, nor have they attended Teacher Education courses. On the other hand, in the worst of situations, Teacher Education professors teach university classes, sometimes oblivious to the relationship of the classes to the world of practice or even to other courses in the program. Administrators manage routine tasks, remaining politically pragmatic, rarely taking risks. Or they may try to impose their own notions of quality programming with token faculty input. Students complain quietly of duplication and fragmentation, but as long as they eventually are recommended for certification, do not become advocates of a rigorous program. Certification officers put the stamp of approval on credentials, never having to

consider the underlying meaning of those requirements (Rate IV, 1991).

When decisions must be made or conflicts resolved, the various players may meet to decide turf issues or how to perpetuate the existing systems. Rarely do they seriously question the efficacy of various components to the point of eliminating those that are dysfunctional.

Informality in academic decision making and bureaucratization of Teacher Education may not be the only causes of insularity. However, they both provide fertile ground for fostering the isolation of the various players from each other and from the basic issue of Teacher Education: how to provide programs which will directly and positively affect the learning of children.

Decision-making processes must be considered which are responsive to the following questions:

1. What are effective ways of involving all players?

2. How can decisions be made in light of the moral obligations of teaching?

3. How can decision-making rules be described and communicated so that all of the players are playing by the same rules?

4. How can a balance be struck between involvement of players and ultimate authority?

5. How can decision-making processes be described so that budget decisions are linked with programmatic decisions?

Decision-making processes must be regarded as dynamic events in which all Teacher Educators participate. The aim of decisions must be directed toward furthering the aim and vision of good teachers and good teaching.

Summary of issues of internal autonomy. Establishing organizational identity, identification of personnel roles, control of budget, and establishing clear decision-making processes comprise the basic issues surrounding the establishment of autonomy within the university or institutional setting. Autonomy, defined as possession of requisite authority to meet assigned obligations and responsibility is not considered to be defined as absolute control of events and decisions. Rather, such autonomy prerequisite to the ability and authority to influence events and to make decisions with substantive input from all appropriate individuals.

Autonomy in the External Political Environment

Political contexts. Autonomy may be gained but not maintained within the educational community unless relative

autonomy is established with respect to external influences. These influences ebb and flow depending on changing political contexts.

In fact, Teacher Education can be likened to a sand castle, carefully constructed, handful by handful. A sand castle is a weighty and solid mass, difficult and impossible to move with a single physical motion. The grains of sand can represent the knowledge of teaching and learning acquired through common sense, careful thought, and research. As long as its existence does not cause trouble for others, the sand castle would remain, shored up by occasional patching by its builders. During low tide, where there is an abundant beach, there is no attempt to change or destroy the sand castle and there is little concern for what occurs within the sand castle.

During times of high tide, when the beach space is reduced, greater attention is focused on the sand castle. Because the beach becomes much more narrow at high tide, the sand castle becomes a nuisance. Beach travelers look for ways to step over or around the sand castle--look for ways to level the sand castle if they can. Eventually, the sand castle becomes unrecognizable as the waves of high tide flow over the edifice. With their backs to the sea, only the builders try to protect it, but their efforts

have little effect because they are simply viewed as the expendable self-serving craftsmen of the beach. They receive little or no assistance.

Throughout the history of the sand castle, there was rarely a question whether the sand castle had any functional utility on the beach. Its builders assumed that everyone understood the noble purposes that the sand castle represented and are bewildered that anyone would try to destroy an edifice that represented such noble purposes.

Like the sand castle, Teacher Education is subject to a multitude of external forces which can act upon Teacher Education issues with great swiftness. Like the sand castle builders, Teacher Educators are often bewildered by the array of political forces sometimes aligned against them.

It has been emphasized that there is a multitude of influences: governmental and organizational. Such forces impinge on Teacher Education (Earley, 1990) and such forces may exert powerfully destructive forces on Teacher Education.

External forces have been characterized as existing in a series of action-influence networks: (a) federal/national, (b) state networks, and (c) local networks. A detailed discussion of these networks and

how they influence Teacher Education can be found in Clark and McNergney (1990). To the extent that Teacher Education can establish credibility is the extent to which Teacher Education will be able to shape and affect these action-influence networks. Currently, Teacher Education has limited influence in these networks because of the widely negative perceptions held about Teacher Education. Clark and McNergney (1990) stated,

> The effort to reform teacher education is complicated by the joint conditions of low mysticism and low confidence. The general public attitude toward teaching is that anyone with a decent substantive background can step into a classroom and be successful. The field has not cultivated the mystical trappings of many professions, the specialized knowledge claims that make it clear that failure of the uninitiated would be total and devastating. The familiarity of the public with the classroom has also supported a lack of confidence on the part of the public that teachers and teacher educators can reform themselves. This combination of low mysticism and low confidence even leads to

> some policymakers to the conclusion that alternative routes to teacher certification that deemphasize or eliminate requirements for professional education beyond subject-matter preparation are likely to improve the conditions of teaching. A field that is insecure in its relationships with its clients is more likely to be conservative in its effort at reform. (p. 116)

Moreover, the lack of public confidence in Teacher Education and in the ability of Teacher Educators to respond to external influences has given policy makers unlimited license to participate in the governance of Teacher Education programs.

Education as a special case in governance. The profession of educating teachers is often compared to the education of other professionals. The evolution of the teaching profession is most often compared to the evolution of the medical profession. In fact, the discussion related to the proposed National Standards Board for the certification of teachers makes reference to the parallels between professional standards for teachers and professional standards for doctors. In particular,

reference is made to the implementation of national standards for teachers in much the same way that national standards were implemented for doctors in the early part of this century. In this discussion, national standards are viewed as the sine qua non of the professionalization of teachers.

The underlying assumption of establishing national certification is that the governance of programs that educate teachers should be structured in the same way that medical education programs are governed. There are at least two reasons why this view may be problematic.

1. Establishing the relationship between theory and practice in teacher education has been viewed as a different process than in medical education.

1. The sheer numbers of teachers that must be educated each year outstrips the ability of Teacher Education programs to implement desirable governance practices in Teacher Education programs.

With respect to the first reason, a chronic problem facing all professions is the linking of theory and practice. Schon (1990) stated,

> In the varied topography of professional practice, there is a high, hard ground overlooking a swamp. On the high, hard

> ground, manageable problems lend themselves to solution through the application of research-based theory and technique. In the swampy lowland, messy confusing problems defy technical solution. The irony of this situation is that the problems of the high ground tend to be relatively unimportant to individuals or society at large, however great their technical interest may be, while in the swamp lie the problems of greatest human concern. The practitioner must choose. Shall he remain on the high ground where he can solve relatively unimportant problems according to prevailing standards of rigor, or shall he descend to the swamp of important problems and nonrigorous inquiry? (p. 3)

In medicine the distance between the high, hard ground and the swamp may be quite a bit shorter than in education. One can make a case that the education of physicians still has as its focus the betterment of the patient's lot. In their education, physicians serve at least a year under the tutelage of more experienced physicians in teaching hospitals, places where healing occurs. Ostensibly, theory and practice become

intermingled as interns and residents work toward common ends.

In the education of teachers, however, student teachers are identified as neophytes, little is expected of them, and they rarely serve in the role of full-time teacher for more than a few weeks. Moreover, course work and field experience are still viewed as separate entities. Somehow, in their first few years of teaching, Mandrake the magician is expected to put it all together for them; they are expected to become master teachers.

Compounding the difficulty in the forging links between theory and practice is the daunting task of preparing large numbers of teachers each year. Because of the need for comparatively greater numbers of teachers, expecting the same duration and intensity of clinical applications in Teacher Education as occurs in medical education may be problematic. Continuing to expect such intensity without a restructuring of the governance of Teacher Education (i.e., drastically increased collaboration with public schools), is actually detrimental to Teacher Education.

Summary of issues of autonomy outside of academia. In summary, coping with the issues of achieving and

maintaining autonomy within the external political environment is dependent on ability to respond to the following questions:

1. What political forces are helpful/harmful to the education of teachers?

2. How is the education of teachers similar/different than the education of other professionals?

3. How can teacher educators become proactive in communicating what is known about the education of professionals to decision makers?

4. How can decision makers recognize the need for educating larger numbers of teachers (in comparison to medical residents) and provide for intensive clinical experience?

Teacher educators cannot regard themselves as protected from the political contexts of funding, diverse agendas, and competing interests. Preserving and effectively communicating the best of Teacher Education (e.g., that which has a demonstrable, positive impact on the learning and growth of all children) may provide a degree of autonomy.

Conclusion

Fragmentation in the governance of Teacher Education remains a major obstacle to providing coherent Teacher Education programs which will ultimately have a positive impact on children's learning. The establishment of a consensual philosophy of governance lies at the heart of developing stable and coherent programs. Several questions must be considered in the development of an explicit philosophy of governance. Whether governance structures are a means to influence or react to events, whether teacher educators believe they can influence the events around them, and whether teacher educators believe in a broad-based collaborative governance structure are the focal questions which must frame any philosophy of governance.

Bringing the processes of Teacher Education governance into alignment is also requisite for the delivery of Teacher Education programs which positively affect the learning of children. Framing any discussion of governance processes is the issue of autonomy. In short, is it possible to establish a degree of autonomy requisite for the governance of Teacher Education programs? And, how can an appropriate level of autonomy be established within

the university community? Autonomy within is dependent on the definition of Teacher Education as an academic unit which, in turn, is dependent on (a) the establishment of a sense of community among all of those who are involved in Teacher Education, (b) on a broad base understanding of the knowledge bases of teaching, and (c) resolution of long-standing conflicts among general education faculty, subject area specialists, and faculty in schools, departments, or colleges of education.

Autonomy is also dependent on the establishment of a new type of relationship between Teacher Education and the central administration in the university which emphasizes teacher preparation as a positive force in the education of all children. Moreover, the relationship between the newly autonomous academic unit and the public schools must address the substantive issues including teacher behavior, learning processes, community relationships, and shared responsibility for learning. Additionally, a diversity of participants must begin to see themselves as teacher educators, including arts and sciences faculty, cooperating teachers, and school administrators. Last but not least, decision-making processes and control of budget must be made more apparent and comprise a much greater emphasis on

collaboration toward the common end of providing quality programs for all children.

Autonomy within the broader political contexts is dependent on the ability to influence a multitude of action-influence networks. An apparent governance philosophy based on collaboration and a coherent program based on a commonly-held vision of the goal of Teacher Education are prerequisite for acquiring such influence. The ability to overcome the public perception that "anyone with a decent substantive background can step into a classroom and be successful" (Clark & McNergney, 1990, p. 116) will determine whether the evolving autonomy within the context of the multitude of action-influence networks is dependent on differentiating Teacher Education from other professions in the manner in which theory and practice are linked. Expecting that same linkages to occur between theory and practice may be problematic because of the current structure of Teacher Education programs and because of the comparatively larger number of teachers who must be prepared, larger than in any other profession.

Currently, Teacher Education is comprised of a severely fragmented governance structure--both within the university and within the broader political contexts external to the university. Because of the current and

widely held belief that Teacher Education has failed to provide quality preparation and because Teacher Education has no constituency, political leaders and others feel free to become directly involved in the governance of Teacher Education. An explicit philosophy of governance must be developed and made apparent within each Teacher Education program. The processes of governance must be addressed as an extension of the consensual philosophy. The issues of governance related to both governance philosophy and process must be addressed systematically if Teacher Education is to achieve the moral vision to which it should aspire.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Clark, D., & McNergney, D. L. (1990). Governance of teacher education. In R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 101-117). New York: MacMillen.

Earley (as spelled on page 19) or Early, P. (December 1990). Issues in teacher education. Paper presented to the Oklahoma Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, Edmond, OK.

Goodlad, J. I. (1991). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Houston, R. (1991). Restructuring the education of teachers: Report of the Commission on the Education of Teachers in the 21st century. Reston, VA: ATE.

Moore & Hopkins, 1991. You wrote another name by this reference on page 11 that I can't read. Please make this name or names clear and supply the reference.

Rate IV. (1991). Teaching teachers: Facts and figures. Washington, DC: American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education.

Schon, D. (1990). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.